

TENTATIVE ADOPTION OF  
2007 OCEAN SALMON MANAGEMENT MEASURES  
FOR ANALYSIS

The Council adopted three salmon management options in March, which were published in Preseason Report II and sent out for public review. In action under this agenda item, the Council must narrow the March management options to a single season recommendation for analysis by the Salmon Technical Team (STT). To allow adequate analysis before final adoption, the tentatively-adopted recommendations should resolve any outstanding conflicts and be as close as possible to the final management measures. This is especially important to ensure final adoption is completed on Thursday afternoon.

The Council's procedure provides any agreements by outside parties (e.g., North of Cape Falcon Forum, etc.) to be incorporated into the Council's management recommendations must be presented to the Council in writing prior to adoption of the tentative options. The procedure also stipulates any new options or analyses must be reviewed by the Salmon Technical Team (STT) and public prior to the Council's final adoption.

If necessary, the STT will check back with the Council on Wednesday, April 4, 2007 (Agenda Item G.4) or at other times to clarify any questions or obvious problems with the tentative measures. The Council must settle all such issues on Wednesday to allow time for STT analysis and to meet the final adoption deadline of Thursday afternoon.

Summaries of the testimony presented at public hearings will be provided at the meeting in the supplemental reports noted below (Agenda Item G.2.c). A summary of public comment letters received at the Council office by March 16 are included in Agenda Item G.2.k.

**Council Action:**

**Adopt tentative treaty Indian ocean and non-Indian commercial and recreational management measures for STT collation and analysis.**

**Reference Materials:**

1. *Preseason Report II Analysis of Proposed Regulatory Options for 2007 Ocean Salmon Fisheries* (mailed prior to the hearings and available at meeting).
2. Agenda Item G.2.j, Summary of Written Public Comment.
3. Agenda Item G.2.k, Public Comment.
4. Agenda Item G.2.c, Supplemental Public Hearing Reports 1 through 3: Summary of Public Hearings.
5. Agenda Item G.2.i, Supplemental SAS Report: Proposed 2006 Ocean Salmon Management Measures For Tentative Adoption.
6. Agenda Item G.2.k, Supplemental Public Comment.

Agenda Order:

- a. Agenda Item Overview Chuck Tracy
- b. Update on Estimated Impacts of March 2007 Options Dell Simmons
- c. Summary of Public Hearings Hearings Officers
- d. U.S. Section of the Pacific Salmon Commission Recommendations Curt Melcher
- e. North of Cape Falcon Forum Recommendations Oregon, Washington, and Tribes
- f. NMFS Recommendations Frank Lockhart
- g. Tribal Recommendations David Sones
- h. State Recommendations Phil Anderson/Curt Melcher/Maria Vojkovich
- i. Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies
- j. Summary of Written Public Comments Chuck Tracy
- k. Public Comment
- l. **Council Action:** Tentatively Adopt Management Measures for 2007 Ocean Salmon Fisheries

PFMC  
03/15/07

## SUMMARY OF WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT

The Council received three written public comments on the ocean salmon management measure options prior to the March 16 briefing book deadline. One comment expressed a preference for Option II in the central Oregon commercial fishery because it provided the most opportunity in October when prices would be highest. One comment expressed dissatisfaction with past Council management practices in regard to Klamath River fall Chinook. One comment requested a five month commercial season in the Fort Bragg area.

PFMC  
03/20/07

**Subject:** [Fwd: 2007 ocean commercial non-Indian Salmon Fishing Options]  
**From:** PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, 16 Mar 2007 08:45:03 -0700  
**To:** Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

Agenda Item G.2.k  
Public Comment  
April 2007

---

**Subject:** 2007 ocean commercial non-Indian Salmon Fishing Options  
**From:** Laurel Johnson <sloughview@verizon.net>  
**Date:** Thu, 15 Mar 2007 21:42:57 -0700  
**To:** pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

March 15, 2007

To The Pacific Fisheries Management Council:

I am writing to express my support for Option Two in the ocean salmon troll fishery. The primary reason that I feel Option Two is better than options One or Three, is because October would be open in Oregon with a 75 fish weekly limit the entire month. To be able to fish early and late in the season is very important to me, because the price is so high. I feel that that is more important than fishing in July, when Alaska and B.C are fishing wide open and the price of Chinook is generally low. For example, if the fishery had opened on March 15th, as of this writing, the forecast was great for a four day trip. So much for the scary March weather. There is no guarantee that the weather is going to be that much better in July, (last year it certainly wasn't), but it is practically a given that the price will be half or less that of the March price. The same goes for October and as a fisher who depends primarily on salmon, the longevity of the season is of paramount importance to me. Since Option Two only has a few more days in early July, but far more significant opportunity in October, I think it would translate into better economic stability and opportunity, especially for that part of the salmon fleet for whom crabbing and other fisheries are less of a consideration. It is those people that I believe the salmon seasons should primarily be designed around. I oppose the short openings proposed for September and October in Options One and Three. It is too short of a time to hope for good weather as well as locate a concentration of fish. The opposition to these short (less than a full week) openings is, from everything I have heard, unanimous. I am suprised to see that they were even proposed. On the other hand, I don't mind the weekly fish limits, because until it is proven that they have no bearing on price, I believe that they are a valuable management tool whose time has come and need to be utilized.

For us to cede the early and late high-dollar fisheries to Alaska and B.C, just so down here we can catch a zillion fish and give them away, is absurd. If a fisher wants to do that they can go tuna fishing. Please maximize the number of fishing days available in the fall, with a limit, and a line if absolutely necessary. I say Option Two provides the best economic stability for the Oregon salmon fleet and their communities.

Respectfully,

Paavo Carroll  
Laurel Johnson  
F/V Titan  
62296 #A Crown Pt Rd  
Charleston, OR 97420

**2007 ocean commercial non-Indian Salmon Fishing Options**

**Content-Type:** message/rfc822  
**Content-Encoding:** 7bit

## Ad Hoc Committee

P.O.Box 484  
Occidental, CA 95465  
707 874-3855 ph/FAX

Pacific Fisheries Management Council

1 of 2  
2/10/07

re: Faulty Salmon Management Plan

- PFMC is presenting an unreasonable management plan based on the controversial assertion that falling below 35,000 natural spawners in the Klamath River requires slashing ocean salmon trolling down to nothing and/or next to nothing thus ruining the commercial salmon fishing industry. The fact is that salmon runs *below* 35,000 in the Klamath are consistently the most productive, and runs *above* 35,000 show dramatic declines three years later. This suggests that water withdrawals and diversions in the basin have dramatically dropped the carrying capacity of the river well *below* 35,000 natural spawners. It makes no sense to celebrate the return of 75,000 or 100,000 natural spawners because 25 years of Klamath data show that the river does not support their offspring.
- PFMC is authoring a controversial and inadequate "Environmental Assessment" that presents a minimal (*de minimis*) fishery plan for no commercial trolling from Point Arena north to Coos Bay, whenever the number of natural spawners is predicted to be between 22,000 and 35,000 in the Klamath River, effectively destroying the trolling industry of Fort Bragg;
- PFMC's Salmon Management Plan (page 4-2) and the Magnuson-Stevens Act specifically require that the PFMC *shall* address in-river conditions affecting salmon habitat causing low stock abundance; and that the PFMC will "work too assure that Pacific salmon ... receive equal treatment with other purposes of water and land resource development". The PFMC has failed to uphold this mandate;
- Excessive water diversions from the Klamath for irrigation agriculture (alfalfa, potatoes), lawns, horses, cattle and domestic uses are causing the collapse of salmon runs due to low water and consequent high water temperatures. PFMC has failed to assert adequate influence per Magnuson-Stevens and their own Fisheries Management Plan to curtail the diversions, and has failed to work closely with certain regulatory agencies and thus failed to uphold their mandate.
- In spite of tremendous protest, the controversial PFMC slashed 2006 commercial salmon trolling in spite of a projected record abundance of *Sacramento River* stocks. Only 4000 female and 4000 male chinook are needed for Hatchery reproduction. *But typically, tens of thousands, even hundreds of thousands more salmon return to Sacramento hatcheries in excess of spawning needs!* Instead of being caught in the ocean by commercial salmon fishermen, these "excess" salmon are given away *free of charge* by the California Department of Fish and Game to a private company in Bellingham, Washington. The filets are designated to be trucked back to California Food Banks and the roe and unused meat "cover expenses". Why an *out of state* company trucking hundreds of thousands of pounds of salmon to the Canadian border and back across three states?

- What is the gross revenue of this private "excess salmon" operation? *How much more revenue do they make from the increase in "excess" fish arriving at the hatchery when commercial salmon fishing is shut down?* Hatcheries were established as *mitigation* for loss of spawning and loss of revenue to the fishing industry. Why isn't some of this revenue returned to the *fishing community* of the State of California? What is the market price for salmon *roe* -- domestically? in the Asian market? in the South American market? Is there a market for milt? How much of the salmon meat is smoked and sold by this private company? Are eggs sold to fish farms? What are the expenses for handling the "excess" fish? How big an operation is it? *Does revenue from processing "excess" Hatchery fish exceed the revenue of the entire California commercial salmon fleet?*
- The PFMC, in *de minimis* conditions, wants *no commercial salmon trolling* in California north of Point Arena, but allows a *full season* for recreational and party boats. This is an inequitable and unfair distribution of the resource.
- The PFMC in *de minimis* conditions wants *no commercial salmon trolling* in California north of Point Arena, but allows trawlers in the Klamath Management Zone. This is unreasonable and inequitable allocation of the resource.
- Commercial fishermen should be allowed, at the very minimum, a catch equal to that granted to holders of a sport fishing license. If the Council does not agree with our reasoning regarding the inappropriateness of the 35,000 Klamath River natural spawner floor, at the very least, they should advocate that each commercial fishing licensee be allowed to catch the equivalent of a sport licensee (2 salmon per man, or whatever is permitted the sport fisherman) during what the Council considers adverse spawning conditions.

With regards to your discussions with NMFS in 2005 and 2006 about the closure of commercial salmon fishing in California and Oregon, please explain your plan for the "excess" fish that would return to Sacramento Hatcheries and the excess "natural" spawners in the Sacramento River system. What did you expect would happen to salmon that were *not* caught in the ocean but would return to the Sacramento river and its tributaries to attempt to spawn and then die. Since you anticipated a "record run" for the Sacramento, didn't you expect there would be a morass of foul stinking carcasses at the base of the dam, or spread out along the river? Did you expect that the number of "natural spawners" could exceed the Sacramento's carrying capacity? How and when did you conceive of a plan to deal with the excessive returns to the Sacramento?

Please send me copies of correspondence between your agency and the California Department of Fish and Game regarding your joint planning for this consequence of your fishing closure policy.



Ann Maurice

# "Blue Northern"

Owner: Keith Olson

RECEIVED

MAR 16 2007

March 16, 2007


PFMC

Dear P.F.M.C.,

I Keith Olson am a commercial Salmon fisherman form Fort Bragg. I have fished for over 30 years out of Fort Bragg. I am very concerned about the Fort Bragg area having as much of a salmon season this year as possible. There are several people that are unable for safety purposes or other reasons to travel out of the area to fish Salmon.

I have attended council meetings for 20 years and have seen the numbers on fish populations projected for this year. There are projected to be an abundance of Klamath and Sacramento rivers fish available in the ocean this year therefore there should be no reason what so ever why we shouldn't get a traditional 5 months season in the Fort Bragg area. There are no statistics anywhere that can prove that Salmon caught off Fort Bragg have negatively affected any runs on any river.

Sincerely,



Keith Olson  
Fishing vessel "Blue Northern"

PH. 707 964 1532 P.O. BOX 1713 FORT BRAGG, CALIF. 95437